

## THE '10 TRUTH' CHALLENGE

**'There's nane ever fear'd that the truth should be heard but they whom the truth would indite.'** (Robert Burns)

**Readers** might have wondered why the above quotation introduces this website. Since she denied being in the murder house, 8 long years ago, Shirley McKie has never been frightened from the truth, sticking to it even when it was not necessarily in her best interests. She has never *'feared that the truth should be heard'* and has always believed that eventually those who were afraid of that truth would be revealed for what they are. It has been an uphill struggle with those *'the truth would indite'* hiding behind diversion and cover up. They have never publicly offered 'truths' of their own. In highlighting **'10 truths'** already in the public domain we offer those who feel we are wrong the opportunity to challenge any one or all of them. Let those who we accuse of seeking to 'justify the unjustifiable' enter the debate and offer their own 'truths'.

**Why don't you take 'THE TEN TRUTH CHALLENGE'? You now have the opportunity to challenge or support any of these 'truths' openly on this website. Replies will be published, (anonymity will be respected providing full name and contact address is given) and responses given.**

- 1) In **July 1997** Professor Colin Espie one of Scotland's foremost Clinical Psychologists examined Shirley on behalf of the Police.

*'After seeing Ms. McKie on 30th July 1997, I was convinced of two things. First, that she was psychologically normal; and second, that she was telling the truth.'*

*When he phoned to say, 'What if the experts are wrong?':*

*'I was told that this was regarded as an "unthinkable" explanation, because of its implications.'*

Had his findings been acted on the trauma of the past 5 years could have been avoided.

<http://thescotsman.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=689152003>

- 2) On **14, May, 1999**, Shirley was unanimously cleared of charges of Perjury by her peers. The only evidence against her was a mark identified by SCRO as Shirley's. Two American experts proved that this identification was wrong.

Prosecution forensic evidence presented by a scenes of crime officer at the trial proved that the mark could not have been left by Shirley over the period stated.

Not one of the 54 Police officers on 24 hours security watch at the murder house or the dozens of experts and detectives examining inside saw Shirley in the house.

<http://shirleymckie.com/mediaarticles.htm> (scroll to 15<sup>th</sup> May 1999 for full coverage)

- 3) In **January 2000** 14 Lothian and Borders Experts wrote to the Justice Minister:

*'At best the apparent 'misidentification' is a display of gross incompetence by not one but several experts within the bureau. At worst it bears all the hallmarks of a conspiracy of a nature unparalleled in the history of fingerprints.'*

<http://shirleymckie.com/documents/LandBExpertsLetteran2000.pdf>

- 4) On **22 June 2000** the Minister for Justice in making an emergency statement in the Scottish Parliament said that an enquiry conducted by the HMCI had concluded, "that, at present, the SCRO is not fully effective and efficient." and that "I certainly recognise this case has caused great distress to Ms McKie and I very much regret that."

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/801354.stm>

- 5) In **August 2000** the HMCI's enquiry was published it concluded:

*'That the mark was not made by Shirley McKie. It is (the independent experts) view that decision could have been reached at an early point in the comparison process.'*

<http://www.scotlibdems.org.uk/xpress/0006223.htm>

- 6) In **May 2002** 171 experts from 18 countries and 26 US states sent a statement to the Minister for Justice stating that the SCRO was wrong in its identification and calling for a review within SCRO. Hundreds of other experts from across the world have joined in the condemnation of SCRO via the internet.

*'I know of not a single latent print examiner who has viewed the images of the "identifications" that concurs with the "opinions" offered by the SCRO "experts" in these infamous cases. Indeed, our colleagues who are recognized as some of the world's foremost authorities in friction ridge skin identification have gone on record and clearly exposed these shameful fabrications for what they really are. Moreover,*

*there are many, many more of us who have conducted our own examination of the marks in question and we can only stand with our mouths agape at this most recent turn of events.’ Wes Sossamon, Fingerprint Expert - 25 3. 2002*

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/1965198.stm>

- 7) In **August 2002** the life sentence given to David Asbury for the murder of Marion Ross was quashed because, *‘The fingerprint evidence was unreliable’*. It was also established that not only was Shirley’s ‘identification’ wrong but another print from the accused’s home identified as that of the murder victim, Marion Ross, was also wrongly identified.

[http://news.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=891692002&rware=JVYDJSFERGLV&CQ\\_CU](http://news.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=891692002&rware=JVYDJSFERGLV&CQ_CU)

- 8) In **September 2002** a Petition was presented to the Scottish Parliament by four of the world’s foremost experts asking for an urgent review to be carried out at SCRO.

[http://shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/14\\_%208%20October%202002%20-%20%20Petition%27s%20Committee%20meeting.pdf](http://shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/14_%208%20October%202002%20-%20%20Petition%27s%20Committee%20meeting.pdf)

- 9) In **February 2003** the Lord Advocate Colin Boyd stated,

*‘The BBC Frontline Scotland programme on the case of Shirley McKie.....changed public perceptions of her case. More importantly it helped uncover what where at best serious defects in the analysis of fingerprinting at the Scottish Criminal Records Office and forced the authorities, including myself, to act to ensure that such a case would not happen again.’*

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/7\\_%2019%20February%202002%20-%20Speech%20by%20the%20Lord%20Advocate.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/7_%2019%20February%202002%20-%20Speech%20by%20the%20Lord%20Advocate.pdf)

- 10) In **October 2004** it was revealed:

- That in 1997 5 SCRO experts disagreed with identification – this information had been hidden from defence and prosecution.
- That in their final report to the Crown Office the Police had recommended that SCRO experts face criminal prosecution.

<http://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/opinions/A4960.html> ( para (4) )

**TO COMMENT:** [justiceforshirley@btinternet.com](mailto:justiceforshirley@btinternet.com)